

## PEER REVIEW HISTORY

BMJ Open publishes all reviews undertaken for accepted manuscripts. Reviewers are asked to complete a checklist review form ([see an example](#)) and are provided with free text boxes to elaborate on their assessment. These free text comments are reproduced below. Some articles will have been accepted based in part or entirely on reviews undertaken for other BMJ Group journals. These will be reproduced where possible.

### ARTICLE DETAILS

<b>TITLE (PROVISIONAL)</b>	Are Complementary Therapies and Integrative Care Cost-Effective? A Systematic Review of Economic Evaluations
<b>AUTHORS</b>	Herman, Patricia ; Poindexter, Beth; Witt, Claudia; Eisenberg, David

### VERSION 1 - REVIEW

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Dr Jo Thompson Coon Senior Research Fellow University of Exeter UK  I am an author of a previous systematic review in this area. No other competing interests.
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	16-Mar-2012

<b>THE STUDY</b>	It is surprising that the authors did not produce a protocol for this piece of work.
------------------	--

<b>REVIEWER</b>	Dr Claire Hulme Academic Unit of Health Economics Leeds Institute of Health Sciences University of Leeds  No competing interests
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	19-Mar-2012

<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	my only concern is that the recommendations don't all follow the findings, many are just best practice in economic evaluation rather than informed by the findings. this should be made clear.
-------------------------	--

<b>REVIEWER</b>	A-La Park Research Officer London School of Economics and Political Science(LSE) United Kingdom No competing interests
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	05-Apr-2012

<b>THE STUDY</b>	Some search terms are redundant. For example, Cost-Benefit Analysis[MeSH] is picked up by Costs and Cost Analysis[MeSH] if the search term was exploded.
------------------	--

	<p>Precise search strategies for each database should be provided rather than having a list in box1.</p> <p>Although I can assume, it was not clearly mentioned whether the authors went through all the full text articles or abstracts only.</p> <p>Details of any model(s) identified are not specifically described in terms of types of modelling techniques. For example, stochastic modelling studies with any statistical analysis in the data synthesis.</p>
<b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b>	<p>Although I can assume, it was not clearly mentioned whether the authors went through all the full text articles or abstracts only.</p> <p>Details of any model(s) identified were not specifically described in terms of types of modelling techniques. For example, stochastic modelling studies with any statistical analysis in the data synthesis.</p>

### VERSION 1 – AUTHOR RESPONSE

Reviewer: Dr Jo Thompson Coon  
Senior Research Fellow  
University of Exeter  
UK

I am an author of a previous systematic review in this area. No other competing interests.

It is surprising that the authors did not produce a protocol for this piece of work.

We will take this into account in the future.

Reviewer: Dr Claire Hulme  
Academic Unit of Health Economics  
Leeds Institute of Health Sciences  
University of Leeds

No competing interests

My only concern is that the recommendations don't all follow the findings, many are just best practice in economic evaluation rather than informed by the findings. This should be made clear.

See the changes to the recommendations section. We removed recommendations 4 and 5 (these both have to do with increasing transferability, but were not specifically discussed in the manuscript), and renumbered for a total of 6 rather than 8 recommendations.

Reviewer: A-La Park  
Research Officer  
London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE)  
United Kingdom  
No competing interests

Some search terms are redundant. For example, Cost-Benefit Analysis[MeSH] is picked up by Costs and Cost Analysis[MeSH] if the search term was exploded.

This is true. However, we were trying to be as thorough as possible in our search. This potential redundancy was important given that we were searching over the full history of each database and

indexing started at different times for different terms, that we were using these terms in several databases, and the previous failures of database indexing to capture CIM.

Precise search strategies for each database should be provided rather than having a list in box1.

The search strategy shown in Box 1 is the precise search strategy used for the PubMed database. The PRISMA statement requires the full electronic search strategy for at least one database to be reported, and the PubMed database generated the largest number of records, so we reported that search strategy. The search strategies for the CINAHL, AMED, PsycINFO, Web of Science and EMBASE databases all used the same text words and (where available) analogous controlled vocabulary terms. This information has now been added to Box 1. We are able to provide precise search strategies for all six databases, if our present edits are not sufficient. Although I can assume, it was not clearly mentioned whether the authors went through all the full text articles or abstracts only.

In total, 13,142 abstracts were reviewed and 789 full-text articles were read as part of the screening process used for this systematic review. Figure 1 indicates that 13,142 records were screened and 789 full text articles were assessed for eligibility. Figure 1 has been revised to make it clearer that the 13,142 records screened included abstracts. The terminology of “records” is what the PRISMA statement uses for the results of a search—i.e., for the title, authors, and abstract of an article.

Details of any model(s) identified are not specifically described in terms of types of modelling techniques. For example, stochastic modelling studies with any statistical analysis in the data synthesis.

Table 4 has been amended to include the type of model used in each article.

#### VERSION 2 – REVIEW

<b>REVIEWER</b>	A-La Park Research Officer The London School of Economics and Political Science United Kingdom  No conflict of interests
<b>REVIEW RETURNED</b>	27-Jul-2012

- The reviewer completed the checklist but made no further comments.